REPETITIVE SYNTACTIC STRUCTURES

Iuliana STANCIU
University of Piteşti

Abstract: *Repetition is a grammatical phenomenon with syntactic, morphologic and stylistic implications, being a phenomenon present at all levels of the language, in purpose or due to the fact that it cannot be avoided.*
Key words: *repetition, syntactic, structures.*

Repetition is a grammatical phenomenon with syntactic, morphologic and stylistic implications, being a phenomenon present at all levels of the language, in purpose or due to the fact that it cannot be avoided. Repetition, as repositioning of a term, "it is designed, at syntactic level, as an expression of the speaker's intention to emphasize the significance of the repeated term (base) thorough an urge marked by a series of specific means. Under this aspect, repetition appears like a syntactic phenomenon with multiple and various uses on a stylistic plan" (DIACONESCU, 1995: 363). In normative grammars it was outlined the fact that "Numerous repetitions represents a certain level of grammaticalization, manifested by using a structural pattern which can be updated depending on the case with different lexical elements" (*GALR*, 2008: 780). In the study *Repetiţia în limba română,* J. Byck proposes to summarize the types of repetitions, approaching the phenomenon as a syntactic process, excluding the repetitions which miss a synthetic function and which pursue only a stylistic effect, as well as the repetitions from folk poetry, as they have a quantity role.

Taking into consideration the shape, it was made the differentiation between immediate repetitions and distant repetitions. The immediate repetition can reposition the base identically or with variations of lexical or morphological nature. The distant repetition comprises, according to J. Byck's study "the examples in which the repeated elements are separated by auxiliary words, which in combination, have a syntactic role" (BYCK, 1967: 154).

In the following, there will be made a summarization of distant repetitive structures, as the ones presented by the author of the study *Repetiţia în limba română*. Thus, the substantive can appear in the following structures: - substantive + preposition + substantive + preposition + substantive + preposition; - substantive + conjunction + substantive; - substantive + conjunction + adverb + substantive; - substantive + preposition + derivates.

The adjective can be part of the following structures: - adjective + preposition + substantive derivative; - adjective + preposition + substantive adjective; - adjective + conjunction + adverb + adjective.

The pronoun enters into structures of the following type: - pronoun + preposition + pronoun; - pronoun + conjunction + pronoun.

The numeral is included in the following structures: - numeral + proposition + numeral; - numeral + conjunction + numeral.

The verb is distributed in three contexts: - verb + conjunction + verb; - verb + adverb + verb; - verb + pronoun + verb.

The adverb appears in the following contexts: - adverb + preposition + adverb; - adverb + conjunction + adverb.

BDD-A5677 © 2009 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:55:52 UTC)

Normative grammars include within the category of repetitive syntactic-semantic structures both the unitary repetitive and non-unitary ones. Regarding the unitary repetitive structures it was outlined that the "Unitary repetitive structures constitute unitary assemblies from the syntactic and semantic point of view" (*GALR*, 2008: 780). Their structure can include both the identical retaking of the base or the retaking with different variations of the base, next to sentences, placed between the terms of the repetition or before each element or next to *şi* conjunction.

A special case of repetitive syntactic-semantic structure is represented by the repetition with ellipsis, some fixed repetitive structures being the result of the ellipsis: *şi mai şi* (instead of *şi mai şi mai*, for example). *GALR*, 2008 musters the unitary repetitive structures, as well as thier semantic values. Therefore, the structures of *x-x* type can give the intensity, the continuity, the approximation, the distribution. The structure of *x and x* type represents the following values: duration, distribution, periodicity, succession, reciprocity, progression. The structures of the *prepoziţie + x + prepoziţie* type can give the progression, the limitation, the periodicity in time, while the structure *x câte x* gives a single value, namely the distribution.

The non unitary repetitive structures had been approached from the perspective of some structures "in which the terms of the repetition are not part of a single syntactic unit, but each of them represents distinct units between which are established various relations" (*GALR*, 2008: 782). In *GALR*, 2008, are mustered several types of such non unitary repetitive structures, as well as their role within the sentence. Among these are included the following structures: - *x, x;* - *x dar x* supposes the repetition of an element, after *dar* conjunction, and strongly emphasized; *x dar ce x; X – ce x?* – y! "it results from the fact that the speaker repeats the word immediately prior, foregone by by *ce*, with rejective intonation, as an apparent form for its correction, but in reality having the role to confer a special emphasis to the following term, said with a strong accent" (*GALR*, 2008: 782). All these structures have the role to intensify from the semantic point of view, the element that is repeated. There are also a series of repetitive structures used as syntactic processes thorough which it is expressed the aspect category of the verb. Regarding this fact, *GALR*, 2008, makes the difference between two types of repetitive structures: - repetitive structures based on coordinates (indicating the unlimited duration): *S-o luptat ei, s-o luptat ...; Şi merge şi merge ...*; - repetitive structures based on subordination (indicating limited duration), mentioning the fact that the second term of the repetition is foregone by *ce* and *cât*.

There must be outlined the fact that not every repetitive structure can reproduce this durative idea; "… the repetition with durative value is characterized in the plan of expression by retaking the verb in the same form, keeping for each segment of the construction the same intonation" (GUŢU ROMALO, SCL, XI, 3: 485 - 493). Therefore, "Between the constitutive elements of the repetition, expression of the aspect, there can be established coordination relations expressed by parataxis or by the relative words *cât* and *ce* or *cât*" (GUŢU ROMALO, SCL, XI, 3: 485 – 493). From the syntactic point of view, it was emphasized the idea that the repetitions with a durative sense represent a unit which forms a composed verbal predicate, and the ones containing verbs in non personal forms constitute units having a determinative function. These repetitions which represent the aspectual value cannot admit isolative determinants which can differ for each element of the repetitive construction, as the determinations make reference to the entire unit, this reference being made from a global perspective over the entire construction. There must be mentioned the fact that "… the aspectual value of the repetition does not depend on the aspectual sign of the

BDD-A5677 © 2009 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:55:52 UTC)

temporal form at the basis …" (GUȚU ROMALO, SCL, XI, 3: 485-493). The repetition can express a durative action, without excluding the final phase of the stated process. Besides these repetitive structures, in order to express the aspect category it can also be used the syntactic process of the ellipsis: "The deletion of the verb expresses, in certain cases, the action under a perfective-causative aspect" (GUȚU ROMALO, SCL, XI, 3: 485-493). In special literature one insisted on the differentiation between the repetitive structures which express the duration and the verbal tenses: "The repetition of the verb (or of the interjection) expresses the duration, the progress in time of the action, also taking into consideration the final phase, the one for ending the action. Through this complex aspectual value, the repetition opposes on the content plan to tenses expressing other aspectual values." (GUȚU ROMALO, SCL, XI, 3: 485-493). Not all the verbal repetitions express the aspect category, and the one doing it are different from the ones not doing it by means of intonation and structure.

The repetitive structures like *Legea e lege; Copiii sunt copii; Datoria e datorie*, are based on the relation subject (the first term of the repetition) – predicative name (the second term of the repetition), pursuing to emphasize the identity of the first term of the repetition.

The repetitions like *Fraţi, fraţi, dar brânza e pe bani*, have a concessive value having the role "to draw the attention on the following syntactic element, usually emphasized and linked by the tautology by adversative coordination, according to the scheme *x (ca) x, dar y*." (*GALR*, 2008: 783). What emphasizes the contrast is not only the repetitive structure, but also a specific intonation, "where the second term of the repetition is said with a melodic peak in stressed syllabus, while the following is, generally, said with a dynamic peak" (*GALR*, 2008: 783).

Through the constructions containing a circumstantial of relation like *De învăţat am învăţat*, one tries to follow a strong topic expressed by the circumstantial of relation *de văzut* placed in the initial sentence.

There is a series of structures which are trying to put in opposition the terms of the repetition, the repeated terms being used without any difference as an expression of the specific of their intensity: *Sunt oameni şi oameni*. The elements of the repetition suppose a pronunciation "in separated stressed groups, at different intonation levels (the first term is pronounced in high tone, and the second in serious tone)" (*GALR*, 2008: 784). There are series of repetitive structures which are based on the relocation of an unarticulated substantive, aiming to express two hypothesis, namely different situations: *Profesor, neprofesor, tot trebuie să plece*. In Romanian language there are also frequent structures of the *x sau x* type or structures based on the coordination of the repeated terms, formed by juxtaposed rhetorical questions, stating the fact that the second question supposes a repetition with a modified topic of the first one: *Ce mi-e popa Stan, ce mi-e Stan popa*. Also at the level of the phrase meet "two temporal, with a conditioning tone, coordinated copulatively, (expressing the moment when the action of the regent with take place, but also a strict conditioning of its realization)…" (*GALR*, 2008: 785). The pronunciation of these structures is done like a stressed group, and the intonation is increasing: *Dac-o fi şi-o fi, vom pleca*. In order to emphasize the idea of contract between the references of each sentence, there are used structures which suppose a coordination relation established between two tautologies: *Vorba (este) vorbă, treaba (este) treabă*. The categorical, definitive character of such statement is expressed by structures like subordinate + regent type: *Cine are noroc are*. In order to express the immutability of a situation there are being used repetitive structures like O*amenii sunt cum sunt*, these structures having a role of a strong argument. There are

BDD-A5677 © 2009 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:55:52 UTC)

also repetitive structures through which we aim to emphasize a semantic content of a certain element within the regent.

GALR, 2008, musters also the following structures: - concessive circumstantial with an emphatic stress on the second term of the repetition, introduced by *că*: *Fierul, ca-i fier, şi tot putrezeşte*; - repetitive structures based on juxtaposition and with a conditional sentence before the regent: *Car mi-a trebuit, car mi-a dat Dumnezeu*; - complex paratactic structure with the scheme: conditional subordinate + regent + conditional subordinate + regent, which supposes the expression of an alternative, but suggesting also the passivity of the transmitter to the resolution of the problem: *Vine, vine, nu vine, nu vine*. There must be underlined the fact that "The repetitive structures, although, by the nature of the repetition, they seem non informative at the level of the sentence content, they have full relevance in the plan of communication: for an adequate interpretation of the message according to the speaker's intentions, a very important role has the fact that repeating an element is generally done with other syntactic function and/ or semantic-discursive, as well as, quite frequently, with another international aspect and/ or stressing" (*GALR*, 2008: 787). But, repetition is not un-informational at the level of the sentence content, the use (or non use) of a repetition bringing an additional (respectively a minus) information.

By syntactic repetitive structures we should not understand just the structures with syntactic function. The integrated repetitive structures, which suppose a dependent relation to the basic term, "enters in the sphere of dependence relations at the syntagmatic or phase level" (DIACONESCU, 1995: 364). The dependence relation is also called in the special literature relation of subordination, being defined as "relation established between two heterofunctional units, distributed at different levels" (DIACONESCU, 1995: 256). The subordination relation is both syntagmatic and phase. This type of relation was characterized like structural, referential and hierarchic. The subordination relation is generating structures and syntactic functions, "the relation and the function being jointly in connection by subordination" (I. Diaconescu, 1995: 256). There was also outlined the fact that "Within the relation of dependence, the syntactical position of the two units is constant, stable, they could be structurally interveted without changing their quality; by structural inversion, manifested both at the syntagmatic level and at the phase level, is produced an intervet of the quality for the two units: the determinate becomes determinant, and the determinant becomes determinate" (DIACONESCU, 1995: 257). Starting from this correspondence of the units, but also of the plans at the syntagmatic level, there takes place the expansion and contraction, a fact supposing a transfer of the relation from the syntagmatic level at the phase level, in case of expansion, contraction. It was outlined that the relation of dependence knows a series of structural performances, being made the distinction between: relation of unilateral dependence, relation of bilateral dependence, relation of collateral dependence and relation of double dependence. Depending on the number of the regents, there was made the distinction between the relation of simple or unilateral subordination, with a single regent, double, with different regents: name of verb, and the relation of incidence, with zero regent. The relation of incidence is different from the other types, having another syntactic hierarchy, fact which imposes its approach separately as a relation of interdependence. It was emphasized that "Unilateral subordination also knows statements where a bond fulfills the same syntactic valence, simultaneously, at two or more regents, coordinators, sometimes intervening the agreement phenomenon: *Cumpărăm, pregătim şi mâncăm alimente; o cultură şi o tradiţie imemoriale; forma şi conţinutul operei; o vreme şi o privelişte minunate*… . Sometimes, a regent can have

BDD-A5677 © 2009 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:55:52 UTC)

two or more bonds, coordinated or not: *Şi-a cumpărat o carte şi o revistă frumoase; O carte frumoasă şi interesantă; Am luat ieri, de la tine, o carte*" (GĂITĂNARU, 2006: 67). There must be emphasized that in the special literature was discussed "the fact that in this situation we deal with a single or two subordination relations (…)" (GĂITĂNARU, 2006: 67). A subordinate relation is established between a regent and a determinant. If there are more determinants, the dependence relation to the regent is repeated. This aspect is supported by the fact that the coordination relation does not suppose a relation between syntactical units of the same type, but supposes a dependence relation of the elements coordinated in respect to the same regent. But, there must be emphasized the fact that "The second term of the appositive report does not subordinate to the first one; but it doubles its reference, being equivalent to it, fact which is proved by the inversion of the terms and the successive substitution with zero" (GĂITĂNARU, 2006: 68). This doubling is actually a repetition. The collateral relation of dependence supposes a repetition as this type of relation "Is based on the relation of unilateral dependence through which is reported to the regent. Its performance supposes the presence of a second term dependent on the same regent, as an obligatory condition. Between the two dependent terms is established a semantic relation based on which is defined the content of the relation, namely the updated syntactic function (…). The absence of the second term blocks the performance of the first term (…)" (DIACONESCU, 1995: 262). The relation of double dependence supposes also a repetition as "It is manifested in a syntagmatic or phase structure, where the determinant or subordinated term (part of a sentence or a sentence) is dominated simultaneously by two different regents as syntactic function, usually, a name and a verb (…)" (DIACONESCU, 1995: 363).

It was emphasized that "The name of extension refers to the fact that is produced in practice an extension of the information (synthemes which satisfy the syntactic valences of the name-subject or of the verb-predicate have in their turn valences which, can also be satisfied) around the same regent (*Această frumoasă casă de vacanţă a ta*), or by taking distance from it (*Obiceiurile oamenilor din nordul ţării noastre*)" (GĂITĂNARU, 2006: 62). The extension and expansion are procedures which can manifest at the level of the sentence and phase. These can be: phonetic, morphological and syntactic. There must be emphasized the fact that there will not be made a detailed presentation of them, but there will be summarized only the aspects which suppose repetition. Among the morphological means are the reaction and the agreement. The reaction is a morphological means which supposes the orientation and direction at the level of subordination relation, as the regent imposes a condition fulfilled by the bond. The second morphological means, the agreement, "is the phenomenon by which, in the virtue of the fact that the regent and its bond have similar morphological categories; in the phrase realized they must coincide. In other words, the regent asks the bond to repeat certain grammatical senses" (GĂITĂNARU, 2006: 71). So, the agreement supposes a repetition at the level of the grammatical senses. The subordination by agreement is specific to the adjective (GĂITĂNARU, 2006: 71). In order to support this aspect we can emphasize the following: "In Latin were repeated all grammatical senses, in a so called atomistic declination (*discipulorum sedidorum: magnitudo operas pulchrae…*). In Romanian, the declination was kept for pronoun and article (singular masculine vocative and singular genitive-dative feminine have also preserved desinences), due to its pronominal origin. As in phases they are articulated, with few exceptions, the first term, the information concerning the case is marked by it (…)" (GĂITĂNARU, 2006: 71).

BDD-A5677 © 2009 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:55:52 UTC)

The relation of coordination supposes a repetition at the level of relations, the dependence of the units coordinated in relation to the regent being doubled. There must be emphasized that "The approach is the relation established between the syntactical units on the same level, being differentiated by the former by subordination, which, as it was shown, operates with units distributed in different levels" (DIACONESCU, 2006: 289). Regarding the relation of adordination, there must be mentioned the fact that "Although it has a series of commune features, the adordination is not manifesting as an homogenous relational process. An assembly of content and expression characteristics define, in case of adordination, two distinct ways: coordination and apositioning" (DIACONESCU, 2006: 291). The relation of coordination was defined as a relation "established between the referential syntactical units, situated on the same axis of ordination or on the same plan" (DIACONESCU, 2006: 291). The coordination can be monovalent or bivalent, both types could be: extensive, extensive-expansive, expansive. There must be brought the following completions concerning these types: "The simplest form for the coordination to manifest supposes an amplification of the extension. In a statement like *Mănâncă ciorbă*, the direct complement is generated by extension (satisfy the valence of the transitive verb). A statement like *Mănâncă ciorbă şi cartofi*, supposes an amplification of the extension. Therefore the coordination is monovalent extensive" (GĂITĂNARU, 2006: 77). There can be noticed that the syntactical units in coordination satisfy, both of them, the same syntactic valence. The coordination is extensive bivalent, if in this relation are coordinated two syntactic units which satisfy different syntactic valences: *Mănâncă orice şi oriunde*. There are also situations when the groups are made by trivalent, tetravalent coordination. If one of the syntactical units within a group which supposes coordination, is engaged in expansion, namely a part of sentence is transformed in a subordinate sentence, by predication, the coordinate in monovalent, extensive-expansive. There is also expansive monovalent coordination (syntactical units are sentences): *Ştiu ce a făcut bine şi ce a făcut rău*. Considering the examples for these groups, there can be given examples with groups which are formed by extensive-expansive bivalent coordination: *Mănânc oricât şi cu cine îmi place*, or the examples of expansive bivalent coordination: *Mănânc când vreau şi cu cine îmi place*.

No matter the type it represents, the coordination supposes a repetition at the level of the relation, no matter that there is repeated the relation of dependence for every terms implicated in the coordination to the regent, or that this relation of the determinant to the regent is doubled. We must make this statement because the problem "if in this situation we deal with a single relation of subordination or two relations, in the perspective of considering as group of coordinated elements, or from the one of repeating each time the regent" (GĂITĂNARU, 2006: 67). We outlined that "Coordination (…) is not a hierarchic, syntagmatic relation generating functions, that is why it operates at all syntactic levels including in its sphere of extension syntactic units of the same kind (homogenous) or distinct as level or function (heterogeneous)" (DIACONESCU, 2006: 293). The coordinated terms are reported to the same regent, the regent being repeated for every element of the construction, its omission supposing the coordination of the elements. The heterogeneous comparison like *E mai mult harnic decât inteligent*, supposes also a double report of the two features to the same term, as well as the homogenous comparison (*Ion e mai deştept decât Maria*) supposes the report of two different terms to the same characteristic, so each of the terms implicated retakes, doubles the relation to the element they refer to. The co-referential relation "doubles the syntactical unit through its co-referent variant" (GĂITĂNARU, 2006: 92). In other words, any apposition retakes, with additional information, the base, being

BDD-A5677 © 2009 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:55:52 UTC)

implicated in two relations: "equivalence, when the base is equal, as sphere, with the co-referent (…*Ascensorul, adică liftul* …) and the inclusion from the genre to species and from the species to genre, when the base and the co-referent do not coincide: *Fluviul Dunărea curge*…" (GĂITĂNARU, 2006: 92).

Therefore, there must be outlined that the repetitive syntactic structures are noted also at the level of the syntactic relations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avram, M., *Gramatica pentru toţi,* Bucureşti, Editura Humanitas, 2001;
Constantinescu-Dobridor, Gh., *Gramatica limbii române,* Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 2001;
Dimitriu, C., *Tratat de gramatică a limbii române, I Morfologia,* Iaşi, Institutul European, 1999;
Dragomirescu, Gh. N., *Mică enciclopedie a figurilor de stil,* Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1975;
Gaitanaru, Șt., *Studii şi articole de gramatică,* Piteşti, Editura Uniyersitătii, 2002;
Găităanaru, Șt., *Gramatica actuală a limbii române,* Piteşti, Editura Tempora ,1998;
Găităanaru, Șt., *Probleme de gramatică,* Piteşti, Editura Universităţii, 2008;
Gutu Romalo, V., *Repetiţia, ca procedeu sintactic de exprimare 9 aspectului în limba română,* în SCL, XI, 3, p. 485-493;
Guţu Romalo, V., (coordonator), *Gramatica limbii române, I Cuvântul, II Enunţul,* Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 2008;
Irimia, D., *Gramatica limbii române,* Iaşi, Editura Polirom, 1997.

BDD-A5677 © 2009 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:55:52 UTC)